

REMARKS

All the claims (except for Claim 59) only stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) in view of U.S Patent No. 7,034,799 to Lee or U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0103174. Claim 59 was rejected as being obvious over these references in further view of U.S Patent No. 7,077,536 to Konomi. For one or more of the reasons set forth below, favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In order to expedite prosecution, certain of the claims (including claim 59) have been cancelled, without prejudice to pursuing them in a continuation or divisional application. Other claims have been amended for clarification purposes and should not be considered as narrowing amendments.

The Examiner's attention is drawn to Figure 5(a) and the related description in the text of the specification. As shown therein, the first display unit 110 is much larger than the second display unit 120 and both are illuminated by a common illumination unit 130. When viewing the first display unit 110, it is possible for the second display unit 120 to cast a shadow onto the first display unit 110. To overcome this problem, an optical sheet 151 is provided that reduces the shadow effects on the first display unit 110.

It is submitted that none of the cited art discloses or suggests the subject matter of the pending independent claims. Thus, they should be in condition for allowance, as should the dependent claims that depend from them. In the last Office Action it does not appear that the Examiner addressed the limitations in the now pending claims when applying the cited art. It is submitted that none of the cited references address the same problems as Applicant's invention nor do they provide any solution to that

problem. Moreover, none of these references discloses the subject matter of the independent claims as defined therein.

By way of a non-limiting example, pending claim 63 is set forth below in which certain limitations have been set forth in bold type for emphasis:

63. (Previously Presented) A display device comprising:
a first display unit with two outer peripheral edges of opposite ends thereof;
a second display unit with two outer peripheral edges on opposite ends thereof, the two outer peripheral edges of said second display panel **being inboard of the two outer peripheral edges of said first display unit;**
an illumination unit between said first display unit and said second display unit; and
an optical sheet with two outer peripheral edges on opposite ends thereof, the two outer peripheral edges of said **optical sheet being outboard of the two outer peripheral edges of said second display unit,** said **optical sheet having an aperture** inboard of the two outer peripheral edges of said first display unit, at least a portion of **said second display unit facing said first display unit through the aperture** in said optical sheet.

As the Examiner is well aware, the references must disclose *all* of the claim limitations in order to support an anticipation rejection under Section 102. However, neither Lee nor Han disclose an optical sheet as claimed. In claim 63, the optical sheet is defined as having:

1. its outer edges outboard of the edges of the second (and smaller) display unit;
2. an aperture inboard of the edges of the first (larger) display unit; and

3. the second (smaller) display unit facing the first (larger) display unit through the aperture in the optical sheet.

In his rejection, the Examiner asserts that Lee has an “optical sheet 515” that discloses these limitations. However, the “lower polarizer 515” in Lee (see column 5, lines 13-31) **completely overlaps both the upper and lower display units**. As a result, its optical effect on the larger display unit is the same throughout the entirety of larger display unit. In contrast, the optical sheet in claim 63 has an aperture through which the second display unit is located. As a result, applicant’s optical sheet only affects the reflectance on selected portions of the larger display unit, here the outer periphery thereof. Applicant’s optical sheet cooperates with the optical characteristics of the lower display unit to achieve uniform and enhanced viewing characteristics on the larger display. As a non-limiting example, the optical sheet may have substantially the same reflectance as the smaller display unit to reduce shadow effects on the larger display unit.

To support his anticipation rejection based on Han, the Examiner points to the optical sheet 4 in Han. It is submitted that Han’s “scattering film 4” (see paragraph [0041]) also completely overlaps the smaller display unit 22. As a result, Han also fails to disclose the claim limitations in claim 63 and cannot serve as an anticipatory reference.

The other independent claims likewise contain limitations not disclosed in the references. For example:

Claim 11 calls for the optical sheet to be “in a **non-overlapping condition** with the display area of the second display unit”.

Claim 35 calls for “an optical sheet that overlaps the display area of the first display unit in plan view and **does not overlap** the display area of the second display unit”.

Claim 53 similarly calls for the optical sheet to be “in a **non-overlapping** condition with the display area of the second display unit”. It further calls for the optical sheet to have “optical characteristics chosen to reduce shadow effects on the first display unit”.

Claim 61 calls for the sheet to have “**an aperture**” with “at least a portion of the second display unit overlapping the first display unit **through the aperture** in the optical sheet”.

Claim 62 calls for the optical sheet to have “**an aperture** at a position that corresponds to the position of the second display unit”.

Claim 63 calls for the optical sheet to have “**an aperture** at a position that corresponds to the position of the second display unit”.

Claim 64 calls for the optical sheet to overlap “the display area of said first display unit at positions to the outside of both of the outer edges of the second display unit and **does not overlap** the display area of the second display unit.”

Therefore, these claims and their respective dependent claims are not anticipated by the references nor made obvious from the references and should be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, for one or more of the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection and pass this application to allowance. If the

Examiner believes that personal contact would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is requested to call the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 27, 2007

By: 

G Gregory Schirley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
GGS/slm